



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/522,563      | 03/10/2000  | Kenneth F. Cook      | 13DV13190           | 5583             |

29399 7590 07/30/2002  
JOHN S. BEULICK  
C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE  
SUITE 2600  
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER

PATEL, PARESH H

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2829

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/522,563

Applicant(s)

COOK ET AL.

Examiner

Paresh Patel

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 13 May 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2829

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 are have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

As to Claim 1, U.S. Patent No. 6205009 discloses in claims 1, 3, 4 and 6: a method comprising the step of summing the voltages (obtaining a sum); determine a difference between a current value (first filter output) of the summed voltage value to a reference value (second filter output); and if absolute value (determining an absolute

Art Unit: 2829

value) of difference exceeds a freeze threshold (a threshold), then maintaining a reference value constant (a fixed value).

Claim 2 is suggested by claims 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claim 3 is suggested by claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claim 4 is suggested by claims 3 and 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claim 5 is suggested by claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

As to Claims 6 and 15, U.S. Patent No. 6205009 discloses in claims 9, 11 and 12: an apparatus comprising: a short term filter (a first filter); a long term filter (a second filter); and a summer (a summer).

Claim 7 is suggested by claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claim 8 is suggested by claim 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claim 9 is suggested by claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claim 10 is suggested by claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claim 11 is suggested by claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claim 12 is suggested by claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claims 13 and 18 are suggested by claim 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claim 14 is suggested by claims 11 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Claims 16 and 17 are suggested by claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6205009.

Please note that the recitation detecting fault in a transducer including a secondary winding having at least two voltages in has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded

Art Unit: 2829

any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).


### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paresh Patel whose telephone number is 703-306-5859. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30 to 4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Sherry can be reached on 703-308-1680.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Paresh Patel  
July 24, 2002

  
MICHAEL SHERRY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800